

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-18 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 2, 5-11, 13 and 14 are rejected. Claims 1, 4-7, 9 and 15 are herein amended. No new matter has been entered. Claims 1-2 and 16-18 are herein canceled.

**Claim Objections**

Claims 1-14 are objected to. In claim 1, line 7, the Examiner asserts that the word “lower” should be replaced by “and lower”. Applicants make this change herein.

The Examiner further asserts that in claim 1, line 1, the word “semiconduct r” in claim 1 should be replaced by “semiconductor”. Applicants reviewed the specification as filed, and conclude that there is no such error in the claim. We assume that the Examiner possesses a defective copy of the claims. Applicants herein traverse the objection.

**Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yonehara et al. (U.S. 2003/0159644A1) in view of prior art as admitted by Applicants (AAPA).

The Examiner admits that Yonehara et al. do not necessarily teach the limitation that said semiconductor substrate meets a criterion of “an SFQR value  $\leq 70$  nm as a flatness of the front face”. However, the Examiner notes that Applicants admit that as many as 40% of all conventionally produced wafers satisfy said criterion. Therefore, by rule of statistics, if a sufficiently large number of wafers are made, some will satisfy the claimed criterion

Applicants herein import the limitations from claims 2 and 3 into claim 1 and claim 14, and subsequently cancel claims 2 and 3. Applicants also herein correct the dependencies of all claims dependent from claim 2. Applicants note that such amendment renders claims 1 and 3-14 patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

Claims 7-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yonehara and AAPA as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of Fitzgerald (U.S. 2002/0123167 A1). Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yonehara et al and AAPA as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Steckl et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,759,908). The Examiner concludes that it would have been obvious to include SiC as a substrate material for an SOI in view of Steckl et al., who teach silicon carbide SOI structures (title, abstract) for the specific purpose of *inter alia* its higher breakdown voltage (see col. 1, line 10-22).

Applicants herein import the limitations from claims 2 and 3 into claim 1 and claim 14, and subsequently cancel claims 2 and 3. Applicants also herein correct the dependencies of all claims dependent from claim 2. Applicants note that such amendment renders claims 1 and 3-14 patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, Applicants submit that that the claims, as herein amended, are in condition for allowance. Applicants request such action at an early date.

Application No. 10/743,793  
Attorney Docket No. 032206


Amendment under 37 C.F.R. §1.111  
Amendment submitted October 21, 2005

If the Examiner believes that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

If this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees that may be due with respect to this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

**WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP**

  
Kenneth H. Salen  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 43,077  
Telephone: (202) 822-1100  
Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

KHS/cas